



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

suggester to Milton of *Paradise Regained*, was attending his father in his coach. Two men waylaid them in the dark, and stopped the carriage. Young Ellwood got out, and on going up to the nearest, the ruffian raised a heavy club, "when," says Ellwood, "I whipped out my rapier, and made a pass upon him. I could not have failed running him through up to the hilt," but the sudden appearance of the bright blade terrified the man so that he stepped aside, avoided the thrust, and both he and the other fled. "At that time," proceeds Ellwood, "and for a good while after, I had no regret upon my mind for what I had done." This was while he was young, and when the forbearing principles of Christianity had little influence upon him. But afterward, when this influence became powerful, "a sort of horror," he says, "seized on me when I considered how near I had been to the staining of my hands with human blood. And whensoever afterward I went that way, and indeed as often since as the matter has come into my remembrance, my soul has blessed him who preserved and withheld me from shedding man's blood."\*

That those over whom, as over Ellwood, the influence of Christianity is imperfect and weak, should think themselves at liberty upon such occasions to take the lives of their fellow-men, needs to be no subject of wonder. Christianity, if we would rightly estimate its obligations, must be felt in the heart. They in whose hearts it is not felt, or felt but little, cannot be expected perfectly to know what its obligations are. I know not, therefore, that more appropriate advice can be given to him who contends for the lawfulness of taking another man's life in order to save his own, than that he would first inquire whether the influence of religion is dominant in his mind. If it is not, let him suspend his decision until he has attained to the fulness of the stature of a Christian man. Then, as he will be of that number who *do* the will of Heaven, he may hope to "know, of this doctrine, whether it be of God."

---

#### THE ALTON TRAGEDY.

THE murder of Lovejoy on the 7th of last November at Alton by a mob, called forth a burst of indignation from every quarter, and contributed to multiply adherents to the cause in which he fell. In this part of the result we sincerely rejoice; but we deeply lament, that the great body of abolitionists should have sanctioned the use

---

\* Ellwood's Life.

of such carnal weapons as Lovejoy and his friends employed. They have thus been guilty of bad faith; they have violated their solemn pledge to the public. We had good reasons to expect they would use only moral means. Some of their leaders were well known as decided peace men; and the American Anti-Slavery Society, in their Constitution and their Declaration of Sentiments, gave the solemn assurances, that "our weapons shall be such *only* as the opposition of moral purity to moral corruption;"—"this Society will never in *any* way countenance the oppressed in vindicating their rights by resorting to physical force;—our principles forbid the doing of evil that good may come, and lead us to reject, and to entreat the oppressed to reject, the use of all carnal weapons for deliverance from bondage, relying *solely* upon those which are spiritual, and mighty through God to the pulling down of strong holds."

What was our surprise, then, to see the American Anti-Slavery Society studiously abstaining, in all its official communications with the public on the subject, from the utterance of a word in disapprobation of the course pursued by Lovejoy in arming himself to defend his *press!* Ingenuity has been tortured to palliate the bloody resistance made by the friends of freedom at Alton; we have heard a leading *officer* of the Massachusetts Society declare, that their chief error lay not in killing *one* of the assailants, but in *not* killing *forty*; and abolitionists *as a body* now stand before the country as responsible endorsers for what their murdered brother did, and as advocates of the right to use the sword in defence of property, and freedom of speech.

The deed is done; and it is too late, we fear, for abolitionists fully to retrieve this error. They seem, indeed, to glory in "taking the responsibility" of Lovejoy's resort to the rifle in defence of his rights; and the national Society at its late anniversary voted, "by an overwhelming majority," to discard that part of the declaration of their own sentiments which had pledged them to a pacific policy. The mask is off; and most deeply do we regret to see them now standing before the world as sticklers for the right of bloodshed in the prosecution of their enterprise. This is the plain English of their doings as a body; and the community must henceforth regard them as determined to free the slaves by argument if they can, by force if they must. We have ourselves heard this very sentiment avowed by one of their leaders, a warm apologist for the rectitude of Lovejoy's conduct in defending his press by the sword; and, though few abolitionists *now* look to such an extension of the principle, they are unconsciously cherishing its spirit, and will probably find most of their future recruits so filled with it, as to make it in the end pervade the whole movement. The peace men in their ranks

are outnumbered, and overborne, and forced into comparative silence, by the war men among them. It is obvious enough, that the spirit, not of Christ and his apostles, but of our revolutionary heroes, is now their predominant spirit.

We beg leave, as friends not only of peace, but of universal enfranchisement by moral means, to put a few questions to the leaders of this great enterprise. 1. *Must not the pacific character and tendencies of your cause be changed in public estimation?* We know it has been denounced at the South as tending to bloodshed; but candid men, we believe, have supposed it to proceed in good faith on its avowed principle of declining a resort to the sword under any circumstances. No man, at the South or the North, can so regard it now.—2. *Will not multitudes of our best men for this reason stand aloof from the cause?* The sympathy excited would of course make large accessions for a time; but, when men come to reason, and the South shall quote from recent anti-slavery documents to prove the violent, bloody character of the whole movement, will there not be a fearful reaction?—3. *Will not this adoption of worldly principles and measures bring into the ranks such men as may ruin the cause?* We all know how it was with anti-masonry; and, from present appearances, we should not be surprised to see politicians, roused by these ceaseless, spirit-stirring appeals to our Revolution, jumping upon anti-slavery as a political hobby, and soon driving away its best friends in disgust.—4. *Does not the present course of abolitionists in this matter tend to a civil and servile war?* God forbid it should ever come; but, should it, would they not be, to a fearful extent, responsible for its atrocities and horrors?

#### REMONSTRANCES OF PEACE MEN AMONG ABOLITIONISTS.

We rejoice to find such prompt and noble remonstrances from the New England Spectator, the Liberator, the Vt. Telegraph, and, we believe, the Friend of Man, against the course of Lovejoy and his friends, in resorting to violence. We subjoin a few specimens.

"The lamented Lovejoy," says Lewis Tappan, in a letter to the Liberator, "called himself a peace man; and yet, when he apprehended that the destruction of his press a fourth time would be followed by the triumph of mob law over the State of Illinois, and ultimately lead to the loss of thousands of lives, he considered that it would save life to make a stout defence, although it might result in the death of a few individuals. In this I think he made a great mistake, and the result appears to show it. The brethren acted on neither the peace nor war principle. The former would have restrained them from any use of bloody weapons, and the latter would have led them to kill, as they might have done, scores of the assailants. In my judgment, God permitted such a failure of the war principle, to show abolitionists the folly of their using carnal weapons."

*Sarah M. Grimke* says, "No abolition society, as far as I have seen the resolutions issued by them, has come out nobly and openly in condemnation of the position, that self-defence is right; and just in proportion as abolitionists have defended the course of our fellow-coadjutor in taking up arms, just in that proportion they are identified with the crime which he committed, and are holding out to their fellow-laborers in the cause of liberty, an incentive to bring to the support of our holy principles the aid of the dagger and the rifle."

"Let us examine how far the appellation of Christian martyr can be applied to one, who died in the act of violating one of our Lord's broadest and most important commands. Jesus Christ, when he delivered his sermon on the mount to the multitude—(mark that! not to apostles, or ministers, but to the multitude), embodied in this discourse all that was essential to form the Christian. In this sermon, among other precepts, Jesus lays down the doctrine of non-resistance: 'Ye have heard that it hath been said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth. But I say unto you, that ye resist not evil; but whosoever shall smite thee on the one cheek, turn to him the other also.' Our great lawgiver knew that if a man did not resist an injury, it was impossible he could inflict one in the spirit of aggression, and therefore he forbids us to resist evil, because that strikes at the root of the sin. His own life was one series of meek endurance of the contradiction of sinners against himself. The dissimilarity between the precepts and practice of Jesus of Nazareth, and the doctrine and conduct of our lamented brother, is too glaring to need any comment.

"Much has been said in extenuation of brother Lovejoy's conduct, about 'defending his life and his property in a manner justified by the laws of this and all other civilized countries.' If this be any justification of crime, then the whole system of abominations, comprehended in that word, slavery, may be justified on the same ground. The South has converted one-third of its inhabitants into chattels personal. She has legalized murder, man-stealing, cruelty; yet we are waging war against her beloved domestic institution, because we believe that her laws contravene the laws of God, and therefore that they are null and void, and cannot palliate the guilt of slavery. If, then, human laws cannot invest me with a title to hold property in my fellow-man, how can they give me a right to take his life? If I cannot, without criminality, reduce man to property, countenanced and protected by the laws of my country, surely it is a self-evident truth, that I cannot innocently reduce the image of God to a mangled and lifeless corpse, without at least equal guilt, however I may be sustained by the laws of man.

"The principles of truth should be inflexibly maintained, let who will suffer. We carry this out, when we say of all slaveholders, they are thieves and robbers. Our business is with principles, not with persons. We must sacrifice our affections and our sympathies to our principles, and not permit the tender sensibilities of our nature to warp our judgment. Besides, it seems to me, that although it is said our brother took up arms to defend great and fundamental principles, a little reflection will show, that this was not the case. Principles can never be defended by violence, persons may; and he who takes up arms professedly to defend principles, takes them in reality to defend his person, which has become obnoxious, in con-

sequence of his having embraced those principles. I wish this fallacy was clearly understood. Every man who professedly takes up arms to defend his principles, shows, in my apprehension, that he is not willing to sacrifice his life for those principles. No man is prepared to come out as the public advocate of truth, until he is prepared to die a martyr to the truth; and unless he is willing, unresistingly, to lay down his life for his principles, he has not learned their intrinsic value, which is the first lesson every reformer ought to understand."

*Rev. S. J. May*, the well-tried friend, alike of abolition and of peace, says, "The first time I heard of the catastrophe at Alton, I expressed my apprehension that it would have a disastrous effect upon the anti-slavery cause. Every movement of the abolitionists since has increased my alarm; no one so much so as the procedure of the Executive Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society, in which you—the President of the Convention at Philadelphia that formed that Society—have acted so conspicuous a part. You have given the influence of your high personal and official name to sentiments and measures that will be fatal, I fear, to the *evangelical* character of that great enterprise which aims to effect the *peaceful* emancipation of millions in our land, from a bondage as abject as has ever been enforced upon any of the human family."

"Very painful to me, indeed, it is to say a word that may wound the feelings of some whose broken hearts I would gladly bind up; but sure am I, that I ought not to see such a wound inflicted upon my Saviour as has been inflicted at Alton, in the house of his friends, and keep silent. What is there distinctive in the religion of Jesus, if it be not that it teaches us to love our enemies, to do good to them that hate us, and pray for them that despitefully use us and persecute us? What is there peculiar in the example he and his apostles have left us, if it be not that they never repelled injury by violence, but sought to overcome the evil dispositions of their enemies by forbearance and kindness! The object of Christ was, and, if we are truly his followers, our object will be, not to intimidate wicked men, so that they will not dare to show their hatred of truth; but to change their hearts, so that they will no longer feel hatred, but love and obey it. How very different, in our view, would have been the character of Jesus and of his religion, if he had died *fighting* in defence of his person, or of his doctrines! We recoil from the thought. And yet I would fain inquire, who may be justified, on Christian principles, in making violent defence, if our Master himself might not! He knew that his was just, and that its success would be promotive of the happiness of mankind. He might easily have overthrown his persecutors. He might have smitten them to the ground with a word of his mouth, or he might have summoned twelve legions of angels to his rescue. But he offered no physical resistance; thus, as it seems to me, settling the question for ever, that no cause, however just and important, and no life, however valuable, may (on Christian principles) be defended by force and arms. Be assured I write under an overpowering conviction of truth and duty, when I add, that brother Lovejoy, in the hour of his death, fearfully violated a distinctive principle of Christ's righteousness—a principle that needs to be assiduously inculcated upon all the in-

jured and outraged slaves, and by which all who plead their cause should scrupulously govern themselves. If, while laboring in his office, or walking in the street, or sitting in his house, he had been attacked, and, under the sudden impulse of that dread of death or injury which is instinctive in man, he had seized the first thing he could lay his hand upon, and had inflicted a deadly blow upon his assailants, Christianity might have justified us in classing his offence among the sins of infirmity. But when we hear of the preparations he had made to defend his press, we must, I think, pronounce it a deliberate offence against the laws of that Master he professed to serve. You have called him a martyr, and likened him to Stephen. But did Stephen throw stones at the mob that pelted him to death? You have called him a martyr; then were those men martyrs who were killed in the war of our Revolution.

"It was especially incumbent upon the Executive Committee of the American Anti-Slavery Society to reprobate distinctly and strongly the course pursued by our ill-advised brother Lovejoy and his associates. In the third article of the constitution of the Society, whose plan they are appointed to execute, it is declared that we 'will never, *in any way*, countenance the oppressed in vindicating their rights by resorting to physical force.' Now, in what other way can we so fully countenance and encourage them in resorting to force, as by resorting to it ourselves? And have not the Executive Committee, by their solemn commemoration of his death, and the style in which they have spoken of it in the *Emancipator*, virtually sanctioned brother Lovejoy's procedure, and thus made themselves responsible for it?

"But that you, dear brother, the President of the Convention at Philadelphia, should have come forward as the eulogist of our misguided fellow-laborer, and not have uttered one word of censure upon his resort to physical force, this is the most alarming inconsistency of which we have any of us been guilty. Your name, and mine, and many others, some of them members of the Executive Committee, are appended to that Declaration of Sentiments, which commences with a contrast between the principles and measures of the American Revolution and of that enterprise in which we had embarked; and closes with a solemn pledge of ourselves to prosecute the peaceful abolition of slavery, 'come what may to our persons, our interests, our reputations—whether we live to witness the triumph of liberty, justice and humanity, or perish untimely as martyrs in this great, benevolent, and holy cause.' When we signed that Declaration, did we mean by perishing as martyrs, perishing as brother Lovejoy has done, with 'carnal weapons' in our hands? You know we did not. Are we willing that henceforth our countrymen should understand that we intend to make *violent* defence of the liberty of speech, and the freedom of the press? to *fight* in the cause of the oppressed? Such is the construction, which it seems to me may be put, with too much propriety, upon the manner in which you and others have treated the Alton battle. Pause, dear brother, and consider what you have been doing! Beseech the Executive Committee to recall some of their words, before it be too late, and avert the disastrous effects of their seemingly unqualified commendation of the procedure of the murdered Lovejoy! If they do not approve and mean to sanction his course, let them say so, speedily, emphatically, that the guilt of a civil war may not in any wise be laid to their charge.

"Hitherto, while our numbers were comparatively few, we have acted in accordance with our professions. Some of us have endured hard treatment, destruction of our property, rough usage of our persons, and even the imminent peril of our lives. But it has been seen and known by all men, that we have not injured any in return, or shown a wish to injure them. It has been the manifestation of this spirit, I am persuaded, that has carried forward our cause with a rapidity unexampled since the progress of Christianity during the first two centuries. And who have been our converts hitherto? They have been principally from among the most sober minded, benevolent, and pious of every denomination. This has been the testimony given respecting us by some of our opposers.

"Now, that we have become a numerous body, and of great consequence, by reason of our numbers, in the estimation of the political parties,—now let us be especially careful in our adherence to our principles. Else shall we find men rushing into our ranks who have not put on Christ—men who have not considered, or do not understand, the reasons by which he purposes to overthrow the empire of sin; and such fellow-laborers will soon involve our country in a servile and civil war."

These are noble testimonies, and we might add another from *Angelina E. Grimke*, now Mrs. Weld, who says she was shocked at the intelligence of Lovejoy's death, "not because an abolitionist had fallen the victim of popular fury, but because he did not fall the *unresisting* victim of that fury. Look at this event, under the supposition that *resistance to evil is right*. Why then did the abolitionists at Alton abandon the press and the warehouse at all? One of them assured the mob, that 'the press would not be delivered up, but that he and his associates would defend it at the risk and sacrifice of their lives.' Why was not this pledge faithfully redeemed? If it was right to fire on the mob at all, it would have been right to resist them with persevering violence; if it was right to wound or to kill one man in defending the press, it would have been right to wound or to kill one hundred. I do not believe that these men lacked courage; but I do believe there was not one of them, who did not, in the secret of his heart, feel misgivings as to the course he had commenced when he saw the bloody consequences of that course—not one of them, who did not shudder at the thought of taking the life of a brother. If not, then they ought to have fought as did the Bunker-hill soldiers, who, when their ammunition was exhausted turned the butt end of their muskets, and beat down the British soldiers whom they could no longer shoot down.

"In reading the account of the mob at St. Charles, I could not but regret, that instead of repelling them there with violence, our brother had not delivered himself up to them, just as our Master did when a mob came to take him. 'He went forth, and said unto them, Whom seek ye? They answered him, Jesus of Nazareth. Jesus saith unto them, I am he,' and then quietly surrendered himself into their hands, though he knew that an ignominous and cruel death would be the consequence. But mark the influence of moral power upon the mob, when he first said unto them, I am he—'they went backward, and fell to the ground.' Amazed at such true magnanimity and courage, they went backward, their physical strength was paralyzed, they fell to the ground powerless, unable to touch him.

Since mobs became so common in our land, I have thought much of what the victims of popular fury should do when thus attacked. Our Lord often escaped before the fulness of time was come for him to offer up his life upon the cross; but let us remember, *he never raised his arm against his foes*; although he knew that the Jews went about to kill him, and ‘that there was no safety for him, and no defence in Judea, either in the laws or the protecting aegis of public sentiment,’ yet he never armed himself in self-defence, neither did he ever appeal to the civil authorities for protection. It appears, then, very plain to me, that if an abolitionist cannot escape from a mob *without violence*, as a Christian he may be assured that the time has come for him to surrender himself a willing and unresisting sacrifice upon the altar of Christian liberty.

“I said that Jesus never armed himself in self-defence—O no! *He had too much moral courage.* The very fact that a man arms himself, and determines to resist violence, shows that he is afraid of that violence: if he is not afraid of it, why does he resolve to ward it off by physical force? I wish this sentiment were better understood. I wish that men would reflect upon it. If they did, I am sure they would see that *true moral courage walks abroad in the midst of enemies unarmed, unprotected by civil authority, undaunted by threats and violence.* This was the courage of Christ, and of Stephen, and of Paul, and of a host of Christian martyrs. And I earnestly desire that THIS may be the courage of all abolitionists. O, that we may never be called to mourn over such another martyr to the glorious principles of universal liberty, as we have in the fallen Lovejoy!”

Miss Grimke makes a touching allusion to Mrs. Lovejoy’s frantic heroism in clinging at St. Charles around her husband’s neck, and beating off the daggers of his assailants; but she strongly condemns her resort to violence as a dangerous precedent. “I should have said nothing on this part of the subject,” she remarks, “if the conduct of our sister had not been held up to view as worthy of imitation. Nothing—had I not feared that others, seeing her thus praised, might be induced to follow her example; for indeed we know not what woman may next be called to witness a similar scene. Instead, then, of smiting the mobocrats in their faces, let her either surrender herself to them, to suffer with her husband, if she *feels* the sacrifice to be called for, or let her follow him afar off, as did the mother of our Lord. If we want to see an example of true moral greatness in woman, under the most appalling circumstances, let us look at Mary standing by the cross of her beloved son, in perfect silence, in holy resignation. Let us watch her countenance as he was extended on the cross, and nail after nail was driven into his hands and feet. Is there not inexpressible agony of feeling depicted there? See we not that in those fearful moments, a sword was piercing through her own soul also? O, what should we think of her, had she in a phrenzy of despair rushed upon the soldiers, and attempted to hinder them in their horrid work, by smiting them in their faces, and clinging round her precious son? Where would have been her dignity, her moral courage, her holy resignation, her Christian greatness? And what would Jesus have said at such interference? ‘The cup which my Father hath given me, shall I not drink it? Let the wives, the mothers, the sisters, the daughters of abolitionists, pray for the spirit of Mary, and then will they be enabled to meet

the violence of mobs in such a way as shall exalt the character of woman, sustain man in the dark hour of temptation and peril, and glorify God by obedience to his holy commands, and submission to the events which are permitted in his providence.

"I feel as though God had permitted these things for our instruction ; and that the lesson he designed to teach abolitionists was, that when there is no safety for them, no defence either in the laws or the protecting ægis of public sentiment, unarmed, *there is none in the use of carnal weapons* ; that there is no such thing as trusting in God and *pistols* at the same time ; and that if life is to be sacrificed, it had better be surrendered as Stephen surrendered his."

**DR. CHANNING'S REMONSTRANCE, IN HIS LETTER TO ABOLITIONISTS.**

"You well know, that I have not been satisfied with all your modes of operation. I have particularly made objections to the organization and union of numerous and wide-spread societies for the subversion of slavery. I have believed, however, that many of the dangerous tendencies of such an association would be obviated by your adoption of what is called 'the peace principle,' in other words, by your unwillingness to use physical force for self-defence. To this feature of your Society, I have looked as a pledge, that your zeal, even if it should prove excessive, would not work much harm. You can judge, then, of the sorrow with which I heard of the tragedy of Alton, where one of your respected brethren fell with arms in his hands. I felt, indeed, that his course was justified by the laws of his country, and by the established opinions and practice of the civilized world. I felt, too, that the violence, under which he fell, regarded as an assault on the press and our dearest rights, deserved the same reprobation from the friends of free institutions, as if he had fallen an unresisting victim. But I felt that a cloud had gathered over your Society, and that a dangerous precedent had been given in the cause of humanity. So strong was this impression, that whilst this event found its way into other pulpits, I was unwilling to make it the topic of a religious discourse, but preferred to express my reprobation of it in another place, where it would be viewed only in its bearings on civil and political rights. My hope was that the members of your Society, whilst they would do honor to the fearless spirit of your fallen brother, would still, with one loud voice, proclaim their disapprobation of his last act, and their sorrow that through him a cause of philanthropy had been stained with blood. In this, I am sorry to say that I have been disappointed. I have seen, indeed, no justification of the act. I have seen a few disapproving sentences, but no such clear and general testimony against this error of the lamented Lovejoy, as is needed to give assurance against its repetition. I have missed the true tone in 'the Emancipator,' the organ of your National Society. I account for this silence, by your strong sympathy with your slaughtered friend, and by your feeling as if one, who had so generously given himself to the cause, deserved nothing but praise. Allow me to say, that here you err. The individual is nothing, in comparison with the truth. Bring out the truth, suffer who may. The fact, that a good man has fallen through a mistaken conception of duty, makes it more necessary to expose the error. Death, courageously met in a good cause by a respected friend, may throw a false lustre over dangerous principles

which were joined with his virtues. Besides, we do not dishonor a friend, in acknowledging him to have erred. The best men err. The most honored defenders of religion and virtue have sometimes been impelled, by the very fervor which made them great, into rash courses. I regret, then, that your disapprobation of Mr. Lovejoy's resistance to force has not been as earnest, as your grateful acknowledgments of his self-consecration to a holy cause.

"By these remarks, I do not mean, that I have adopted 'the peace principle' to the full extent of my late venerated friend, Dr. Worcester, whose spirit, were he living, would be bowed down by the sad story of Alton. I do not say, that a man may in no case defend himself by force. But, it may be laid down as a rule, hardly admitting an exception, that an enterprise of Christian philanthropy is not to be carried on by force; that it is time for philanthropy to stop when it can only advance by wading through blood. If God does not allow us to forward a work of love without fighting for it, the presumption is exceedingly strong, that it is not the work which he has given us to do. Is it asked, how such a cause, if assailed, is to be advanced? I answer, by appeals to the laws, and by appeals to the moral sentiment and the moral sympathies of the community. I answer, by resolute patience and heroic suffering. If patience and suffering, if truth and love, will not touch a community, certainly violence will avail nothing. What! shall men, whose starting-point is the love of every human being, hope to make their way by slaughter? Shall a cause, which relies on the inculcation of the disinterested spirit of Christianity as its main instrument, seek aid in deadly weapons? Are we not shocked by this incongruity of means and ends? What fellowship has moral suasion with brute force? What concord between the report of the rifle and the teachings of philanthropy?

"Nothing is plainer than that Mr. Lovejoy, had he succeeded in his defence, could not have accomplished his purpose, but would have placed him in a position more unfavorable to doing good than before. Suppose him, by a sustained and well-directed fire, to have repelled his assailants. Would he have planted his press in Alton? The following morning would have revealed the street strewn with dead bodies. Relatives, friends, the whole people of the surrounding country, would have rushed to the spot. What rage would have boiled in a thousand breasts! What vows of vengeance would have broken from a thousand lips! The men, one and all who had been engaged in the defence of the press, would probably have been torn limb from limb at the moment. If not, assassinations would have dogged them night and day; and we should have been startled with successive reports of murders, till the last victim had fallen. Or suppose Mr. Lovejoy to have fled with hands stained with blood; could he have preached with success the doctrines of love? Would not that horrible night have been associated with all his future labors? Happy was it for himself, happy for your cause, that under such circumstances he fell. I beg that this language may not be so construed, as if I question the moral or religious worth of Mr. Lovejoy. I know nothing of him but good, except his last error; and that error does not amaze me. That a man hunted by ferocious foes, threatened with indignities to his person, and with death; and at the same time conscious of the greatness of his work, conscious that civil rights, as well as the interests of the oppressed, were involved in his decision; that a man, so tried, should fail in judgment,

we need not wonder. He knew that the constitution and laws were on his side. He knew that the prevalent construction of the precepts of Christ, which gives a wide range to self-defence, was on his side. We can easily comprehend, how a good man, so placed, should have erred. I believe in his purpose to do and suffer for great truths and man's dearest rights. God forbid that I should give the slightest countenance to the scoffs of men, who, had he fallen on their side, would have lauded him to the skies.

"It seems to me of great importance, that you should steadily disavow this resort to force by Mr. Lovejoy. There are peculiar reasons for it. Your position in our country is peculiar, and makes it important that you should be viewed as incapable of resorting to violent means. You are a large and growing party, and are possessed with a fervent zeal, such as has been unknown since the beginning of our revolutionary conflict. At the same time, you are distrusted, and, still more, hated by a multitude of your fellow-citizens. Here, then, are the elements of deadly strife. From masses so hostile, so inflamed, there is reason to fear tumults, conflicts, bloodshed. What is it which has prevented these sad results in the past, in the days of your weakness. Your forbearance; your unwillingness to meet force by force. Had you adopted the means of defence, which any other party, so persecuted would have chosen, our streets might again and again have flowed with blood. Society might have been shaken by the conflict. If, now, in your strength, you take the sword, and repay blow with blow, what is not to be feared? It is one of the objections to great associations, that they accumulate a power, which, in seasons of excitement and exasperation, threatens public commotions, and which may even turn our country into a field of battle. I say, then, that if you choose to organize so vast a force for a cause which awakens fierce passions, you must adopt 'the peace principle' as your inviolable rule. You must trust in the laws and in the moral sympathies of the community. You must try the power of suffering for truth. The first Christians tried this among communities more ferocious than our own. You have yourselves tried it, and through it have made rapid progress. To desert it might be to plunge the country into fearful contests and to rob your cause of all its sanctity."

We like much the general drift of this remonstrance; but we think Mr. Garrison's strictures on one part of it very just and forcible. "Is it consistent," he asks, "for a man who rejects the doctrine of non-resistance, to enforce it as a religious duty upon others most exposed to peril, suffering and lawless outrages? There is a beam in his own eye—a mote only in theirs. He observes, 'I do not say that a man may in no case defend himself by force; but it is time for philanthropy to stop, when it can advance only by wading through blood.' The theory, then, is this: a cause which is *not* benevolent, will authorize the shedding of blood without guilt, that which *is*, will not; so that, if I kill a robber merely for my own preservation, I do well; but, if I lay down my life in defence of liberty, the rights of man, and the cause of God, all must be 'shocked by this incongruity of means and ends!' If men may fight at all, may they not fight for that which is most valuable?"